



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

give it in full, lest we might be accused of omitting anything essential; but printing in italics the parts we intend to discuss; which parts, as we proceed, will assume a more startling aspect than at first sight appears.

The letter was written to Anzir, an African king, and is as follows:—

"Your nobleness has sent your letters to us this year in order that we should ordain Servandus, the presbyter, a bishop, according to the Christian constitution, which, because your request appears just and excellent, we have taken pains to do. Sending us gifts, you have, through reverence for blessed Peter, prince of Apostles, and love to us, dismissed the Christians who were held captive among you, and you have promised that you will dismiss other captives also. In fine, God, the Creator of all, without whom we are not able even to do or to think anything good, has inspired this goodness in your heart. He who illuminates every man that comes into this world has illuminated your mind in this intention. For omnipotent God, who wishes to save all men, and that none should perish; there is nothing which He more approves in us than that man, after loving Him, should love man, and should not do to another what he would not wish to be done to himself. This love, therefore, we and you owe to each other, especially more than to other nations: we who believe and confess one God, though in different ways: we who daily praise and venerate Him as the Creator of ages, and the Ruler of this world. For, as the Apostle says, 'HE IS OUR PEACE WHO HAS MADE BOTH ONE.' But many of the noble Romans, knowing through us this grace given to you by God, entirely admire and proclaim your virtues. Among whom, two of our friends, Albericus and Cincius (brought up with us in the Roman palaces almost from youth itself, greatly desiring to attain to your friendship and love, and to serve you freely in whatever it may please you in our parts), send their men to you, that by them you may understand how prudent and noble they esteem you, and how much they wish and are able freely to serve you. Commending whom to your magnificence, we ask that you will study to render to them, for love of us, and in recompense of the fidelity of the aforesaid men, the same love which we desire always to pay to you and all yours. For God knows that we sincerely love you to the honour of God, and desire your salvation and honour in the present and future life. And that God Himself, after a long period of this life, may lead you into the bosom of blessedness of the holy patriarch, Abraham, we ask with heart and mouth."

Such is the letter of Pope Gregory. The occasion, certainly, was one which required a grateful letter; and it is pleasant to see a pope grateful, especially such a pope as Gregory VII.

But there are principles which a Christian bishop should never surrender, even in the compliments which gratitude suggests. We will now examine how Pope Gregory dealt in this letter with the two questions we have alluded to, viz.:—1. The appointment of Bishops. 2. Exclusive salvation in the Church of Rome.

1. It is clear that this African king kept the nomination of bishops in his own hands. The king chose Servandus to be consecrated a bishop, and the Pope consecrated Servandus accordingly. Yet it was Pope Gregory VII. who fought and won the great battle with the emperor, kings, and princes of Europe about the appointment of bishops. How marvellous that Pope Gregory VII. should have been so submissive to an African prince! We will make that submission more marvellous still before we have done.

2. With respect to the second question—exclusive salvation in the Church of Rome—Pope Gregory VII. clearly points out that some religious difference existed between him and the African king to whom he wrote. He says:—"We who believe and confess one God, though in different ways." Clearly there was some religious difference between them, which the Pope could not altogether overlook, and yet that difference did not prevent the Pope writing in language of mutual brotherhood and love.

Truly the Pope was right when he said that nothing is more pleasing to God than that next to the love of God we should love man too, and Pope Gregory seems to think that mere love to man should be founded on, or at least be strengthened by, our knowledge of God. For he says that he and this African king should have a greater love to each other than the Pope could have with other nations: why? Because, he says, "we believe and confess one God;" and "He is our peace who has made both one." And Pope Gregory does not think that lesser differences in religion or in worship should prevent such happy consequences following from the great truths concerning God in which we all agree; for he says this mutual love and kindness should follow from our acknowledging one God, even "though in different ways."

Happy would it have been if popes had always made due allowance for those who differed from them in some things, while acknowledging and worshipping the same God. Alas, it is sad how little disposed men are (even popes) to inculcate love on account of things in which we agree, instead of hatred on account of things in which we differ.

We can imagine now our Protestant readers exclaiming in astonishment at our taking such lessons as these from Pope Gregory VII. What! (they will say), from

Hildebrand! from Pope Gregory VII.; that great firebrand of the Church and of the earth; the man who first put the interests of Rome and her supremacy in conflict with every interest of love and peace and harmony among men, and destroyed the peace of the world then and forever, to exalt the spiritual power of his Church upon the ruins of love and charity among men! Our Protestant readers, no doubt, do regard Pope Gregory VII. in this light; and in their surprise they will ask, "Is the editor of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN gone mad to take his text from Pope Gregory VII. to preach love and harmony between those who differ in worshipping one God in different ways? Or has the whole Protestant world (and a great part of the Roman Catholic world too) been wrong in the views they have formed of the ruthless policy and objects of Hildebrand—Pope Gregory VII.?"

Now, the Editor is not mad. There is Pope Gregory's letter, and it is our duty to draw lessons from it. We also know how seldom popular notions of history do adequately represent the facts of past times. The editor, therefore, ventures to form original views of his own from original documents, and draws his lessons accordingly; and with the impartiality which should govern his conduct, cares not one straw whose prejudice he may shock, whether they be Protestants or Roman Catholics.

We cannot remove surprise at this letter of Pope Gregory VII. We can only increase the astonishment both of Protestants and Roman Catholics.

We hold that love should exist and be cultivated in spite of religious differences. We hold, too, that religious differences are not unimportant; and that such differences may be of the highest importance, and may involve duties of the highest obligation. St. Paul thought so when he exclaimed, "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel."

In considering religious differences, we must consider their nature, that we may not so overlook them as to cease from preaching the Gospel. Much as we admire the general sentiments of Pope Gregory's letter, we cannot subscribe to his method of applying them in this instance; at least, we must first examine what the religious difference was in this case.

A difference there was:—"We believe and confess one God, though in different ways." What was the difference, and how broad was it, between the Pope and the African king.

One thing strikes us as strange, and, perhaps, has struck our readers as strange too, in this letter of the Pope, and that thing is—there is no mention of Christ, and no allusion to Christ, in this letter of the Pope!

Was it "a forget" in the Pope? Alas, no! The Pope wanted to be very civil, and it would have been very rude to have mentioned Christ in this letter!

For this African king did not believe in Christ! He was not a Christian! He was a Mahometan!!!

The Saracens had conquered Africa; the Saracens were then the kings and princes of Africa; and the Saracens were Mahometans. A handful of Saracens invaded and conquered a country. They could not exterminate all the Christian inhabitants; they had to rule them; and, therefore, "the Christian dogs," on payment of tribute, were allowed the exercise of their religion. But the Saracen princes, like the Turkish sultans afterwards, kept in their own hands the nomination of bishops for their Christian subjects. Pope Gregory VII., who convulsed all Europe sooner than leave the nomination of bishops, as it had been before, with Christian princes, quietly submitted to have Christian bishops nominated by Mahometan kings in Africa, because the Saracens were there the ruling power, and would have "stood no nonsense" on the subject.

But viewing that African king as a Mahometan, the "liberality" of Pope Gregory VII. is enough to make both Protestants and Roman Catholics stand aghast.

The letter not only does not mention Christ, but it carefully speaks of God in Mahometan language, and not in Christian language. God is described as "God, the Creator of all;" "The Creator of ages, and the Ruler of this world;" but never as "The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

That a Pope (and such a Pope) should write to a Mahometan that God had inspired his heart, and enlightened his mind, and that they were worshipping one God, "though in different ways;" and to apply to that "one God" whom Mahometans worship, as proving the union of Christians and Mahometans, the words which Scripture applies to Christ alone—"He is our peace who has made both one;" and to found on this his hopes, and almost his assurance, of salvation, in the rejection of Christ: such liberality as this, we think, amounts to a denial of the Gospel of Christ.

Leaving all judgment to God, and not presuming what his judgment will be, or ought to be, concerning Mahometans, we yet hold that that "liberality" which sets aside the preaching of the Gospel is spurious and false.

From those who so set aside and deny the Gospel we never expect to find that true liberality which the Gospel teaches. It would be a miracle, indeed, if the Pope who thus threw over the faith of Christ to flatter a Mahometan king should ever have shown any sympathy, or kindness, or charity towards any Christians believing in Christ who showed any spirit of insubordination to the Church of Rome. If any Roman Catholic can point out to us any one of the multitudinous letters of Pope Gregory VII. which inculcated liberality towards fellow Christians who declined implicit obedience to Rome, we shall be happy to

print it. But we never heard Pope Gregory accused of anything of the kind.

The lesson we now draw from it is this: popes, and bishops, and priests do not themselves believe in the doctrine (as commonly understood) of exclusive salvation in the Church of Rome. But they do consider that doctrine as a very useful means of exercising power and influence over all who can be brought to believe it. They use it with the people; they explain it away in theological discussion; they profess the utmost liberality in this respect, when it suits their purpose; they practically treat it as an instrument of power, and not as an article of faith.

Some of our readers may be shrewd enough to have observed that those priests who most countenance and promote the notion that all Protestant heretics will be damned, are ever the loudest in promising God's favour, and heaven itself, to every Protestant squire or lord who will give land, or money, or hold a plate at a collection in chapel. In all such cases in future let our readers call to mind the authority given for such liberality of the priests in the letter of Pope Gregory VII. to the MAHOMETAN KING.

PRACTICES OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH WITH RESPECT TO THE EUCHARIST—No. II.

WE purpose in the present article to continue an attempt which we commenced in our last number, to judge of the doctrine of the ancient Church by her practices, and to examine whether those practices were consistent with a belief in transubstantiation. Our object is to inquire did the ancient Church merely treat the consecrated elements with that reverence which is due to them as the appointed means by which the faithful are made partakers of the body and blood of our blessed Lord, or did she act as if she believed that under the appearance of bread and wine the body, soul, and divinity of our Redeemer were locally resident on thousands of altars on earth, not so much to be partaken of by the people as to be the great object of their adoration. We can tell how she would have acted if she had believed in transubstantiation, because we know what the practices are into which this belief has led the modern Church of Rome. If we find the practices of the ancient Church to be totally different, may we not conclude with certainty that her faith was not the same.

We need not repeat the several points of difference on which we dwelt in our last article, but merely recal to our readers' recollection the last point on which we were contrasting the practices of the ancient and modern Church. The Church of Rome, thinking as she does concerning what is contained under the appearance of bread and wine, takes the greatest possible care to guard so sacred a treasure from the least possible danger of profanation. She entrusts the charge of it to none but her priests, and allows it to be preserved nowhere except on the altars of her temples. The ancient Church, on the other hand, knew nothing of such precautions, but allowed all Christians, men and women, to carry the consecrated elements home with them, where they looked it up in their boxes, and sometimes applied it to uses which no one now would consider seemly. We were speaking last of those who made up the consecrated elements into cataplasms, and we have now to mention a usage repugnant to the feelings even of a Protestant, but which, to one who believed in transubstantiation, must have been impossible, namely, the employment of the consecrated wine as ink for writing with. Yet, three remarkable instances can be produced of a pope, a general council, and a king who did so. The first is of Pope Theodorus, who, as Theophanes relates (see Baronius, A.D. 648, sec. 14), when Pyrrhus the Monothelite departed from Rome, and as came to Ravenna, and returned like a dog to his vomit, "and when this was found out, Pope Theodorus, calling a full congregation of the Church, came to the sepulchre of the head of the Apostles, and asking for the divine cup, he dropped some of the life-giving blood into the ink, and so with his own hand made the deposition of excommunicated Pyrrhus!" The next instance is the doing of the same in the condemnation and deposition of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, by the Fathers of the fourth Council of Constantinople (which Roman Catholics call the eighth general council), on which occasion (see Labbe, tom. viii., p. 1231) the bishops subscribed, not with bare ink, but, dipping their pen in the very blood of our Saviour, condemned and deposed Photius. The last example is that of a peace or agreement made between Charles the Bold and Bernard, Count of Barcelona, which is said to have been confirmed and signed *Sanguine Eucharistico*—with the blood of the Eucharist.

Examples like these throw light on the language of the writers of the time, and show that when, according to their usual custom, they give to the consecrated elements the names of the things which they represent, and speak of them familiarly as the body and blood of Christ, they did not then use the words in their highest and proper sense; since it is hard to believe that if the Christians then thought them in this sense entitled to these names they would have subjected them to the profanations of which we have given instances.

We shall next mention another usage equally irreconcilable with a belief in transubstantiation—the burial of the Eucharist with dead bodies. Thus, we are told in the life of St. Basil that he kept a portion of the Eucharist to be buried with him, and left it to be so by his

last will. Again, St. Gregory, in his *Dialogues*, which contain many strange stories, tells us also a story of a monk, who, having died in sin, could not rest quiet in his grave, but every time he was buried was found next day out of his grave, until St. Benedict gave the communion of the Lord's body, and commanded that it should be buried with the young monk, after which he kept his grave, and the earth threw him out no more. We read, moreover, accounts of pieces of the Eucharist having been found with the bodies of ancient saints when they were disinterred. For example, in the life of St. Othmar, we are told that when he came to be translated some years after he was buried, they found under his head and about his breast little pieces of bread, which were, with much reverence, laid by his body again. And, in like manner, when St. Cuthbert was buried, he is described as having "his head bound with a napkin, the Eucharist laid upon his holy breast, with his sacerdotal habit upon him," &c.

It is little less than a demonstration that they who thus treated the sacrament did not believe it contained a hidden Deity, under the species of bread and wine; for, surely they would not then have so used the Lord of life and glory as to imprison him, as it were, and suffer Him to be buried with the putrid carcases of the dead.

Another important head of difference in the practice of the two Churches is the great solicitude in the modern Church to prevent any accident occurring in the administration of the Eucharist, of which we find no trace in the ancient Church.

We have already referred to this head the denial of the cup to the laity, and shall now mention a change in respect of the bread. In the ancient Church the Eucharist was celebrated with such bread as was commonly eaten, which was taken out of the oblations of the people. This old practice the Church of Rome has altered, and now insists that the Eucharist shall be celebrated with unleavened bread; because this is less apt to break into crumbs, and cleaves better together in its parts. This is one of the points in dispute between the Roman and the Greek Church, the latter having never departed from the ancient practice of using common bread in the Eucharist. The Romish Church has also invented those little round wafers which they consecrate for the bread of the sacrament, and take care hereby to prevent breaking into crumbs; for they never break them for distribution, but put them whole into the communicants' mouths; whereas, the ancient practice was to provide one whole loaf of substantial bread, and to divide this into parts, and break it to be distributed among all. But these little hosts are brought to such a tenuity that they are next door to what they call *species*, having scarce any substance, and hardly deserving of the name of bread. In fact, the Missal itself supposes that they may easily disappear, one of the cases for which it provides being that of the wind carrying them away.

Now, perhaps, the most decisive proof that the ancient Church knew nothing of this great caution in the administering of the Eucharist is the fact that they administered it to infants as soon as they were baptized. It is acknowledged by Roman Catholics that this was a practice that prevailed in the Church for several hundred years; traces of this custom existing even so late as the eleventh century. Now, where such a custom existed, it is impossible that there could have existed those fears and scruples as to accidents occurring to the consecrated elements which prevail in the Church of Rome; for when sucking children are to receive either bread or wine it is impossible to hinder the happening of something which the Church of Rome would call highly dishonourable to the sacrament. This is well illustrated by a story told by St. Cyprian, in his work *De Lapsis*, of a Christian little girl who, by the nurse's wickedness, had received polluted bread in an idol's temple, and afterwards was brought by her mother, knowing nothing, into the Church to receive the holy communion. St. Cyprian relates how the child, when its turn came to receive the cup, turned away its face, shut its lips, and refused the cup. But the deacon persisted, and though the child struggled against it, poured into its mouth some of the sacrament of the cup. Then, he says, "followed sobbing and vomiting; the Eucharist could not remain in a mouth and body which had been polluted."

Now, this story sets in a highly striking light the difference in practice between the Church of the third century and the modern Church of Rome. The latter will not give the cup even to an adult layman, capable of using the greatest care and reverence in the reception, lest, perchance, a single drop of the consecrated wine might fall to the ground; while a deacon of the ancient Church pours the sacrament into the mouth of a struggling infant, and with the results which might be expected in such a case. It will be observed, too, that St. Cyprian does not in the least censure the conduct of the deacon, or consider it inconsistent with the practice of his Church. He only tells the story to point out the incompatibility of any communion with idols with Christian communion. It is impossible but to believe that such cases as are here related must often have occurred when the communion was given to an infant, and it follows, therefore, that the ancient Church could have

had none of those scruples and fears as to accidents in the celebration that prevail in the modern Church of Rome. Does it not follow, then, also, that they could not have had that belief in the corporeal presence out of which those scruples took their origin.

This opinion is confirmed by the fact that we can only trace the practice of communicating infants down to the ages when the notion of transubstantiation was set on foot, and became ready to be formed into an article of faith. When once the idea of transubstantiation was entertained, the practice of infant communion was speedily felt to be incompatible with it, and was immediately abandoned.

This inquiry into the practice of the ancient Church throws great light upon the discussions as to her doctrines which we have entered into in other articles. We can produce and have produced several passages in which they employ language expressly at variance with a belief in transubstantiation. Roman Catholics oppose to us other passages in which they apply lofty titles to the consecrated elements, calling them freely by the names of the things which they represent. Now, when we want to discuss whether their language is to be understood in this representative sense, or in the strictly literal and proper force of the words, the question is in a great measure decided by an examination into the actions of the men who used this language. Their conduct will show what their words mean, and we are persuaded that no one who weighs well the practices which we have described in this and our former article on this subject can suppose, that the men who used those practices believed in transubstantiation.

ATTRITION AND CONTRITION.

THE love of God is the great characteristic of all true religion. It is impossible to look into any part of the sacred volume without meeting with abundant proofs that it is the religion of the *affections* which God particularly requires, and that none other is acceptable in His sight.

After Moses had received the tables of the law from the hand of God Himself on Mount Sinai, he thus addressed the people—"And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee but to fear the Lord thy God, to walk in all His ways, and to love Him and serve Him with all thy heart and with all thy soul; to keep the commandments of the Lord, and His statutes, which I command thee this day for thy good?" "And it shall come to pass, if ye shall hearken diligently unto my commandments, which I command you this day, to love the Lord your God, and to serve Him with all your heart, and with all your soul, that I will give you the rain of your land in due season, &c., &c."

See also the exhortation of Joshua: "Take diligent heed to do the commandment of the law, which Moses the servant of the Lord charged you, to love the Lord your God, and walk in all His ways, and to keep His commandments, and to cleave to Him, and to serve Him with all your heart and with all your soul."

So David exhorts his son—"And thou, Solomon, my son, know thou the God of thy father, and serve Him with a perfect heart, and with a willing mind, for the Lord searcheth all hearts."

"My son, give me thine heart," is the language of holy writ in every page of the prophets of old. And is that of the Apostles and Evangelists a different one?

Our blessed Lord, in His sermon on the Mount, proclaims the very reverse: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil."

When a certain lawyer tempted Him, saying "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" our blessed Lord said to him, "What is written in the law? how readest thou?" And he answering said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself." And Jesus said to him, "Thou hast answered right; this do, and thou shalt live."

St. John inculcates the duty of love to the brethren on the assumption that no one can be a Christian without love to God. "God is love, and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him. . . . We love Him, because He first loved us. If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother, whom he hath seen, how can he love God, whom he hath not seen? . . . By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep His commandments."

The advocates of the Church of Rome appear to rely much on the assertion that they are a more *devout* people than those of any other religion.

Let us try them by this test. Do they insist more than others upon the necessity of this holy principle, the *love of God*? Or is it nearer the truth to say that *fear* is the mainspring which they look on as sufficient, coupled with external observances, to fit mankind for heaven, and make them meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light—thereby taking on themselves to dispense with

that love of God with all the heart, and mind, and soul, and strength, which the holy Scriptures hold out to us in every page as the real touchstone of all true religion?

What *contrition* of heart or spirit is, no one acquainted with the written word can be ignorant. "Thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy: I dwell in the high and holy place with him, also, that is of a contrite or humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones." "The Lord is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart, and saveth such as are of a contrite spirit."

To get any idea of what *attrition* means, we must, however, go to the schoolmen of modern times; for even the ancient Fathers will, we believe, be found as dumb about it as the Scriptures themselves.

At what date exactly the distinction was first devised by the metaphysical brains of scholastic divines we can scarcely venture to assert; but we think we may assert that it was never established as a matter of faith before the Council of Trent that anything short of true *contrition* would suffice, even accompanied with the so-called *sacrament* of penance, to restore the sinner to the favour of God; for Dominicus Soto, Bishop of Segovia, who afterwards took a leading part at the Council of Trent, in his work on the 4th book of the Sentences, published not long previous to that Council, distinctly lays it down that "it is merely a matter of doctor's opinion, and not of the certitude of faith, that any one can, from a mere state of *attrition*, be converted into a state of *contrition* by the sacrament of penance." It was at that period, therefore, clearly not a settled point.

But what, our Protestant readers will say, is *attrition*, and wherein does it differ from *contrition*?

The turning point, good reader, is simply this, that the *love of God* is essential to *contrition*; the *fear of hell* only is essential to *attrition*.

Attrition is that imperfect *contrition* which arises from the *fear* of the eternal punishments of hell, as contradistinguished from that sorrow for sin which arises from the *love of God*, and grief at having offended Him.

The popular modern saint, Liguori, in his Instructions for the Clergy and Missioners, thus distinguishes them—"Attrition is the sorrow one feels for having offended God from an imperfect motive; for example, because of the blackness of sin; that is to say, because of the hell we have merited, or the paradise we have lost. So that *contrition* is a sorrow for sin because of the injury done to God, and *attrition* is a sorrow for the offence done to God because of the evil which it causes ourselves."

In another page of the same work (p. 208) the same writer gives his readers examples of what he calls acts of *contrition* and *attrition*, which are as follow:—

I. An act of *attrition*.

"O God, because by my sins I have lost paradise, and merited hell through all eternity, I profoundly repent of having offended thee."

II. An act of *contrition*.

"O God, because thou art of infinite goodness, I love thee above all things, and, because I love thee, I repent of all the sins which I have committed against thee, who art the sovereign good, and I sorrow more for them than for all other evils. My God, henceforward I will not offend thee more. I would rather die than render myself for the future guilty towards thee."

So far, perhaps, the distinction might be considered innocuous, and, perhaps, by some even salutary, as tending to warn men against mistaking false and superficial for sincere and true *contrition*; but the danger of introducing human inventions and metaphysical distinctions into the simple dictates of God's revelation will at once appear when we state our next proposition.

Attrition, without the sacrament of penance and the absolution of a priest, will not alone justify man before God; yet *attrition* joined with the sacrament of penance and priestly absolution will do so.

Is this the mere private opinion of the doctors? Nay, but the deliberate teaching of the Council of Trent itself, as interpreted by all modern Roman Catholic divines.

In treating of the Sacrament of Penance, in Sess. xiv., chap. iv., on *contrition*, the Council thus teaches—

1. Isaias lviii. 16.

2. Dominicus Soto (Segobienensis), *Salmantica*, 1666, p. 725, in Quart Sent. Distinct 17, quæst. 2, art. 6—"Præterea quod ex attrito fit quis per sacramentum contritus: non est certitudo fidei, sed doctorum opinio."

3. Liguori *Opus Completum*, tom. xavii. Paris, 1842. *Instruction* pour les Curés et les Missionnaires. Chap. v. De la Pénitence. Sec. 7. De la Contrition. No. xx. p. 139—"L'attrition est cette douleur qu'on éprouve d'avoir offensé Dieu par un motif moins parfait, par exemple à cause de la noirceur du péché, c'est-à-dire à cause de l'enfer qu'on a mérité et du paradis qu'on a perdu. De sorte que la contrition est une douleur du péché à cause de l'injure faite à Dieu, et l'attrition est une douleur de l'offense faite à Dieu à cause du mal qu'elle nous cause."

Liguori thus states this doctrine—"XXI. Quand on a la contrition, on obtient aussitôt la grâce avant de recevoir le sacrement avec l'absolution du confesseur, pourvu que le pénitent ait l'intention, au moins implicite, de recevoir le sacrement en se confessant."—*Council of Trent*, Sess. 14, c. iv.

4. Voici comment doit se faire l'acte d'attrition.—"Mon Dieu, pense que par mes péchés j'ai perdu le paradis et mérité l'enfer pendant toute l'éternité; je me repens souverainement de vous avoir offensés." Voici comment se fait l'acte de contrition.—"Mon Dieu, parce que vous êtes la bonté infinie je vous aime plus que toute chose, et parce que je vous aime, je me repens de toutes les fautes que j'ai commises envers vous qui êtes le souverain bien, et je me repens plus que de toutes les autres fautes. Mon Dieu, désormais je ne vous offensai plus; je veux plutôt mourir que de me rendre à l'avenir coupable envers vous"—Id. p. 203.

1. Deut. x. 12, 13.

2. Deut. xi. 13, 14.

3. Joshua xiii. 5.

4. Matthew v. 17.

5. St. Luke, x. 25—28.

6. 1 John iv. 16, &c., v. 2.